arXiv:1511.08521v3 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 5 Jan 2016

# Comments concerning the Ising model and two letters by N.H. March

Michael E. Fisher[a], Jacques H.H. Perk[b,*]

[a] *Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-8510, USA*
[b] *Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, 145 Physical Sciences, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078-3072, USA*

**Abstract**

Two recent articles by Norman H. March that contain misleading statements concerning 3D Ising models, partly based on earlier erroneous work of Z.D. Zhang, are addressed.

*Keywords:* Critical exponents, Universality class, Ising model
*PACS:* 05.50.+q, 64.60.F-, 75.40.-s

About a decade ago Zhidong Zhang claimed to have solved the three-dimensional Ising model exactly and he circulated draft versions. After several theorists including the two of us had patiently explained errors in the drafts, Zhang shockingly got an enlarged version published [1]. That the result was in error was pointed out by Wu, McCoy, Fisher and Chayes [2], who showed that Zhang's formula for the free energy could not reproduce the known high-temperature series expansion while, at low temperatures, his results likewise failed, disagreeing with C.N. Yang's exact result for the 2D spontaneous magnetization, etc. Perk exposed further errors, especially the erroneous application of the Jordan–Wigner transform [3]. This should have been the end of it.

However, Zhang next got Norman H. March to join him and by now there are more than two dozen wrong or misleading papers published by them. A detailed invited commentary on several of these has been published [4] in a Polish mathematics journal. Zhang then published a review paper in Chinese Physics B, that was intimidating to some younger scholars in China, as their Monte Carlo results disagreed with Zhang's work. To help resolve the issue F.Y. Wu and one of us were invited to a speak about it at a conference in Beijing, resulting in another detailed and this time very blunt comment [5].

However, we were saddened when only a few weeks ago some more recent papers [6, 7, 8, 9] came to our attention. March still advocates a theory of the critical exponents based on $\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma = 5/4$ for the three-dimensional Ising model. Even though these values had been suggested in the long ago past [10, 11], they were based on relatively short series expansions and are no longer supported by the best research. March thus had to appeal to the erroneous works of Zhang [1] to support these values.

There is an excellent review by Pelissetto and Vicari [12] that one may consult for recent expert opinions. The many theoretical and experimental results quoted in section 3.2 there make it clear that the claims of March are untenable. The results constitute, however, strong support for the new theory of El-Showk et al. [13]. This is an exciting new development in the three-dimensional Ising model using convex optimization of the *c*-parameter within the conformal bootstrap approach to the four-point correlation functions. It gives accurate bounds on the critical exponents that agree with the accepted estimates in the literature. More precisely [13, 14] yield the two scaling dimensions,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\sigma &= 0.518151(6) = (1+\eta)/2, \\ \Delta_\epsilon &= 1.41264(6) = 3 - 1/\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

from which we calculated

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= 0.62998(3), \\ \eta &= 0.036302(12), \\ \alpha &= 0.11007(7), \\ \beta &= 0.326423(18), \\ \gamma &= 1.23708(5), \\ \delta &= 4.78982(7), \\ \Delta_{\rm gap} &= 1.56351(7) = \beta + \gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

*Corresponding author
*Email address:* perk@okstate.edu (Jacques H.H. Perk)

In (1) we have given the improved bounds obtained by Simmons-Duffin [14]. The first-correction-to-scaling exponent is [13]

$$\omega = 0.8303(18) = \Delta_{\epsilon'} - 3,$$
$$\Delta = 0.5231(12) = \omega\nu. \tag{3}$$

Note that this value of $\Delta$ is close to $\frac{1}{2}$, which has been used for some time in unbiased fits like

$$\chi \sim |t|^{-\gamma}(1 + \text{const}|t|^{\Delta}), \qquad t = 1 - \frac{T}{T_c}, \tag{4}$$

for the susceptibility [11].

In his articles in *Physics Letters* [6, 7] March does not cite the comments on Zhang's work but he refers to them in [8], where he gives the impression that someone only has to prove two conjectures by Zhang, even though these have been disproved already. March also suggests in [6, 7] that Zhang's critical exponents $\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma = 5/4$ agree within experimental accuracy with all existing experiments and theory. This is falsified in many works, as discussed above.

Recently March has published two further papers [15, 16], the second with two coauthors, in which he now proposes to accept $\alpha > 0$ but still claims $\gamma = 5/4$ to 'within both experimental and theoretical "error"' and 'as known either exactly, or to high accuracy,' see [16, p. 14]. He asserts [15] that the presently intractable mathematics of the 3D Ising model was bypassed by Zhang via two conjectures; however, because of some controversy raised, he now proposes a generalization with $\alpha \neq 0$. Nonetheless we stress that even $\gamma = 5/4$ is no longer compatible with well established and accepted values for the 3D Ising model such as recorded in (2) above. Besides the review [12] cited above there are several more recent papers, such as the Monte Carlo study of Hasenbusch [17] implying $\gamma = 1.23719(26)$ and the experimental study of Sengers and Shanks [18] giving $\gamma = 1.238 \pm 0.012$. The most accurate experimental values of $\gamma$ are all less than $5/4$ and their average properly weighted with the error bars is significantly below $5/4$.

In conclusion, the articles by March in *Physics Letters* [6, 7] are doubly misleading: first, because the Zhang exponents are outside the best experimental and theoretical ranges; and, second, because March does not mention the comments on Zhang's work that could have alerted the referees.

The authors thank Dr. Martin Hasenbusch for a very useful comment.

## References

[1] Z.D. Zhang, Philos. Mag. 87 (2007) 5309–5419 [arXiv:0705.1045]
[2] F.Y. Wu, B.M. McCoy, M.E. Fisher and L. Chayes, Philos. Mag. 88 (2008) 3093–3095, 89 (2009) 195 [arXiv:0811.3876]
[3] J.H.H. Perk, Philos. Mag. 89 (2009) 761–764 [arXiv:0811.1802]
[4] J.H.H. Perk, Bull. Soc. Sci. Lettres Łódź Sér. Rech. Déform. 62:3 (2012) 45–59, [arXiv:1209.0731]
[5] J.H.H. Perk, Chin. Phys. B 8 (2013) 080508 [arXiv:1307.1753]
[6] N.H. March, Phys. Lett. A 378 (2014) 254–256
[7] N.H. March, Phys. Lett. A 379 (2015) 820–822
[8] N.H. March, Phys. Chem. Liquids 52 (2014) 697–699
[9] F. Mozaffari, Phys. Chem. Liquids 53 (2015) 481–489
[10] C. Domb and M.F. Sykes, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 240 (1957) 214–228
[11] A.J. Liu and M.E. Fisher, J. Stat. Phys. 58 (1990) 431–442
[12] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Reports 368 (2002) 549–727 [arXiv:cond-mat/0012164]
[13] S. El-Showk, M.F. Paulos, D. Poland, S. Rychkov, D. Simmons-Duffin, A. Vichi, J. Stat. Phys. 157 (2014) 869–914 [arXiv:1403.4545]
[14] D. Simmons-Duffin, JHEP 2015:06 (2015) 174 [arXiv:1502.02033]
[15] N.H. March, Phys. Chem. Liquids 52 (2014) 815–819
[16] N.H. March, G.G.N. Angilella and R. Pucci, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 28 (2014) 1430019 [arXiv:1411.0219]
[17] M. Hasenbusch, Phys. Rev. B 82 (2010) 174433 [arXiv:1004.4983]
[18] J.V. Sengers and J.G. Shanks, J. Stat. Phys. 137 (2009) 857–877